P.R. No. 2022/06
Presented by Shri Hemant Kothawani
dated 13.4.06

C.S. 1001

SINGLE BENCH

9
3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2628 / 2006

PETITIONER:

Sharad Kumar Shrivastava,
S/o Late Shri Rambilas Shrivastava,
Aged about 47 years, Occupation
Pump Operator , R/o Sehgal Gali,
Masanganj, Bilaspur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS:

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through the Secretary,
General Administration Department,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya
Raipur, (C.G.)

2. The Secretary,
Department of Water Resource,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya
Raipur, (C.G.)

3. The Chief Engineer,
Water Resources Department , Raipur,
District Raipur, (C.G.)

4. The Chief Engineer,
Minimata Hashdeo Bango Dam
Division, Bilaspur, (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY
13/4/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUENCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBTION, CERTIORARI, AND ANY OTHER WRITS, DIRECTIONS OR ORDERS.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

25

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP(S) 2628/06 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	12.6.2006:- Shri Hemant Kesharwani, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Sushil Dubey, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents. Heard both the counsel. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Pump Operator vide order dated 31-12-87 and he was posted in the office of Executive Engineer, Arpa Nahar Department, Sakri in the pay scale of Rs.478.80 per month. The benefit of 5th Pay Commission was granted to the employees of erstwhile State of M.P. and the Class-3 category employees were given the benefit of pay scale of Rs.3050-75-3950-80-4500 which has been accepted by the State of Chhattisgarh also, but the petitioner has not been granted the benefit, therefore, respondents be directed to grant similar benefit to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to the respondent No.2 and in turn he be directed to decide representation to which learned counsel for respondents has no objection. Request made by learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be just and fair. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation to the respondent No.2 within a period of 2 weeks from today and in turn respondent No.2 is directed to decide representation of the petitioner within a period of 5 months from the date of receipt of representation after considering all the grievances of the petitioner raised in representation in accordance with law. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Barve